

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 12, 16, and 19 are independent. Claims 6, 10, 13, 16, and 19 have been amended, and no claims have been added or canceled by this Amendment.

No new matter is involved with any claim amendment, which have been made merely for overcoming the objection to claim 10 and for general clarification, and specifically not to overcome any art of record.

Claim Objection

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 10 is requested. Claim 10 has been amended in a manner that is believed to overcome the stated basis for objection.

Anticipation by Salmela et al.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 12, 14, 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Salmela et al. (WO 98/30056) is requested. Applicants traverse the rejections because the cited art fails to disclose all limitations of the claimed method (independent claim 1), network (independent claim 12), and network element (independent claim 16).

Applicants note that anticipation requires the disclosure, in a prior art reference, of each and every limitation as set forth in the claims.¹ There must be no difference between the claimed invention and reference disclosure for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.² To properly anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.³ “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”.⁴ “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim.”⁵ In determining anticipation, no claim

¹ *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

² *Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

³ See MPEP § 2131.

⁴ *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

⁵ *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

limitation may be ignored.⁶ In view of the foregoing authority, the cited reference fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 12, and 16 as previously presented.

Discussion of Applicants' Disclosure

By way of background, one or more embodiments of Applicants' disclosure are directed to a mobile communications method, network, network element, and mobile station in which exclusive location areas comprising exclusive cells are defined in order to separate cells from the mobile stations not belonging to the user group allowed to camp in the cell, and still to allow emergency calls for all mobile stations any sales. During location update, the system checks whether the cell belongs to an exclusive location area and, if it does, the system determines whether or not the subscriber is allowed to camp in the cell.

Such special service areas are commonly referred to as localized service areas (LSA), and the concept of LSA extends the operators' capability to offer different service features to subscriber or subscriber groups, different tariffs, and different access rights, depending on the location of the subscriber. One feature of the concept of LSA is "exclusive access" (EA). EA attributes may be managed as part of cell management. An exclusive access cell is a cell where only mobile stations having the same exclusive access information as the cell are allowed to camp. With the EA concept, it is possible to guarantee that the members of a user group are the only users of the radio channels (physical resources) within a cell. In order to support exclusive access, other users' mobile stations must be prevented from camping in that cell. Emergency calls, however, should be allowed in a limited service state for every mobile station in the exclusive access cell.

In one or more aspects of Applicants' disclosed and claimed invention, specific exclusive location areas are used comprising exclusive cells, *i.e.*, cells with restricted access. Separate location areas are used for the normal cells, *i.e.*, non-exclusive cells. ***With such location areas, it is guaranteed that when entering a location area, location update is triggered.*** During the location update procedure, the subscriber's right to access the cell is determined. If the subscriber is not a member of the user group allowed to camp in an exclusive cell, the location

⁶ *Pac-Tex, Inc. v. Amerace Corp.*, 14 USPQ2d 187 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

update will be rejected. However, the rejection of location update will still allow emergency calls to be placed in a limited service state.

As further background, Applicants' disclosure at ¶ [0004] discusses the fact that mobile stations not supporting LSA are not impacted by local service areas, and ¶ [0010] discloses an embodiment of Applicants' disclosure that uses a location areas and location area updates in a procedure that determines a mobile station's right to access the cell.

Discussion of Salmela et al.

According to the Abstract, Salmela et al. ("Salmela") is purportedly directed to mobile communications system in which localize special services are offered by a method for controlling the local operation of a mobile station (MS) which includes forming a group of special cells from selected network cells, and controlling the operation of the mobile station on the basis of the group. According to the disclosure of Salmela, if the old and/or new cell is a special cell, information on this is transmitted to the mobile station already in a handover command, whereby the mobile station may refuse handover.

Salmela merely discloses a solution for providing localized services in cellular systems. In Salmela, location areas form regions within each of which the mobile station may roam freely without notifying the visiting location register. Additionally, Salmela discloses that a list of special cells may be defined for a subscriber. The cells in this list form a subscriber-specific localized service area that is, by definition, specific to the subscriber. That list of special cells may be utilized to control the operation of the mobile station used by the subscriber. Salmela also discusses several types of special cells, and mentions also control operations restricting the access of the mobile station to some cells.

The Examiner appears to have misunderstood the disclosure of Salmela by seemingly equating Salmela's Localized Service Areas (LSA) with Applicants' claimed location area. However, Salmela fails to disclose, teach or suggest defining some of the location areas to be exclusive location areas each associated with a respective Location Area Code (LAC), an exclusive location area including exclusive cells for which an exclusive service condition is defined.

The Office Action referred to the localized service areas of Salmela, which are defined as a list of special cells drawn up for a subscriber (for example, page 4, lines 9-10, and 15-16, and page 5, lines 15-16, and page 15, lines 26-33). Thus, the definition is made *for a subscriber* or a subscriber group (page 15, lines 26-28), *and not for a location area* of the network subsystem. A special cell of a location area may then naturally exist in a special service area; however, in Salmela, the other cells with the same location area identifier may or may not belong to the special service area. Thus, a subscriber roaming within a location area may try to camp in special cells and non-special cells without having a trigger to update its location.

Moreover, Salmela fails to disclose, teach or suggest checking, during a location update procedure, whether a new location area indicated by the LAC is defined as an exclusive location area. Since no exclusive location areas are defined, such checking is neither discussed nor suggested in Salmela. In fact, the only action implemented during the location update procedure in Salmela is delivery of the list of special cells to the mobile station, *which is clearly not the same as the action implemented during the claimed location update procedure*. Simply put, *delivery of a list of special cells does not correspond with checking a location area type*.

Although Salmela does disclose a checking operation, it occurs at a different stage, *i.e.*, when the mobile station receives a new broadcast cell identifier. The checking is also implemented differently in that the mobile station checks whether the new cell is in its own list of special cells. Thus, *checking a cell identifier does not correspond with checking a location area, as variously claimed*.

Additionally, Salmela fails to disclose or suggest using an exclusive service condition of a cell in determining whether or not the subscriber is allowed to camp in the cell. To the contrary, in Salmela, *any* control operations restricting the user's ability to camp in the cell are made based on a list of cells of a subscriber, *not* on an exclusive service condition that is defined for a particular cell and governing operations of that cell. A cell identifier itself does not relate to any particular service, and *a list cell identifiers of a subscriber* is clearly not the same as *an exclusive service condition of a cell*.

Salmela discloses that a cell (identified by cell identity), a location area (identified with LAI), and the localized service area (identified by LSA-IDs) do not correspond to each other,

and therefore differ from each other. See, *e.g.*, page 2, lines 3-4, "[t]he geographical area controlled by the visitor location register is divided into one or more location areas LA, within each of which the MS may roam freely without notifying the VLR", and also see page 5, lines 14-18 which states "a special service area is defined for a mobile subscriber by drawing up a list of certain network cells, *i.e.*, special cells, for the subscriber. The list can be utilized in a mobile station or in a fixed network. In the present application, such a special service areas referred to as LSA (Localised Service Area)".

In other words, the "location area" disclosed in Salmela arguably corresponds to the "location area" defined in Applicants' claims, however the "localized service area" in Salmela does not correspond to the location areas defined in Applicants claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Salmela teaches defining some of the location areas to be localized service areas. However, ***Salmela does not teach a location area defined to be localized service area*** (page 4, lines 1-12 disclose subscriber-specific localized service areas comprising selected network cells; page 5, lines 14-18 discloses the above definition for mobile station-specific localized service area; page 7, lines 26-28 discloses mobile station-specific localized service area; and page 8, line 6-12 discloses a definition of the special cell). In addition, and assuming, *arguendo*, that Salmela taught or suggested the above features, Applicants' claimed feature relates only to location areas which do ***not*** correspond to localized service areas.

Specific Deficiencies of the Applied Art

Specifically, the applied art does not disclose a method for deciding whether a mobile station used by a subscriber is allowed to camp in a cell of a mobile communications system comprising location areas each associated with a respective Location Area Code (LAC), wherein the method includes, *inter alia*, ***"defining some of the location areas to be exclusive location areas each associated with a respective LAC, an exclusive location area comprising exclusive cells for which an exclusive service condition is defined..."***[and] if the new location area is an exclusive location area...allowing the mobile station to camp in the cell by accepting the location update if the subscriber is allowed to camp in the cell, and...preventing the mobile station from

camping in the cell by rejecting the location update if the subscriber is not allowed to camp in the cell", as recited in independent claim 1, as previously presented (*emphasis* added).

Further, the applied art does not disclose a network that includes, *inter alia*, "...**location areas each identified by a Location Area Code (LAC) and defining groups of cells**...wherein at least one of the location areas identified by the LAC is defined to be an exclusive location area comprising at least one exclusive access cell for which exclusive service condition is defined, and...**in response to a location update of a mobile station, to check whether the location area in the location update and indicated by LAC is defined as an exclusive location area and if it is, to use the exclusive service condition of the cell to determine whether or not the subscriber is allowed to camp in the cell**", as recited in previously presented independent claim 12 (*emphasis* added).

Finally, the applied art does not disclose a network element in a mobile communications system taking part in location update procedures between the system and a mobile station, said system comprising location areas each associated with a respective Location Area Code (LAC), wherein, *inter alia*, "...**the network element is arranged to store or to have access to information about location areas defined as exclusive location areas each associated with a respective LAC**...and, **in response to a location update to a cell belonging to a location area identified a new LAC, to check whether the location area indicated by the new LAC to which the location update is targeted is defined as an exclusive location area and if it is, to use the exclusive service condition of the cell to check whether the subscriber is allowed to camp in the cell**...", as recited in independent claim 16, as currently amended (*emphasis* added).

To summarize, Salmela fails to teach defining exclusive location areas, and the checking process relating to them during location update. Therefore claims independent claims 1, 12, and 16 are patentable over Salmela, as well as dependent claims 2-9, 13-15, and 17-18, which are submitted as being patentable over Salmela at least from their dependency from their allowable independent claims, without further recourse to the patentable features recited therein.

Unpatentability Rejection over Salmela et al. in View of Nordstrand and Seppanen et al.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 10-11, 13, 15 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salmela et al. (WO 98/30056) in view of Nordstrand (US

6,334,052 B1) and Seppanen et al. (US 5,903,832) is requested. The Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. The legal requirements for unpatentability have been discussed above.

At the outset, Applicant notes that, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria offer useful insights. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.⁷ Further, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure.⁸ The Supreme Court recently held that it is necessary, *inter alia*, for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the claimed. In this regard, the Court held "[t]o facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit."⁹ "[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness."¹⁰

The Office Action admits the deficiencies of Salmela in failing to teach or suggest determining the possibility of camping in a mobile station and camping measurements being taken after that, and alleges that Nordstrand remedies this deficiency.

Further, as discussed above with respect to the anticipation rejection of independent claims 1 and 12, dependent claims 8, 13, and 15 variously and ultimately depend from these patentable independent claims, and are submitted as being allowable at least on that basis, without further recourse to the additional patentable features contained therein.

Further Discussion of Salmela et al.

With further reference to claims 10 and 19, Salmela also fails to disclose broadcasting an indication indicating that the cell is an exclusive cell that belongs to an exclusive location area.

⁷ See MPEP §2143.

⁸ *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) and See MPEP §2143.

⁹ *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____ (2007) (see p. 14).

¹⁰ See *Id.*, citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

Salmela merely discloses that a base transceiver station may broadcast some cell-specific information, for example a cell identifier or a message indicating that the cell provides a certain special service for the mobile stations in the network. However, since no exclusive location areas are defined, and cells of one location area may be exclusive or non-exclusive, such a message does not give any indication on whether the cell belongs to an exclusive location area.

Discussion of Nordstrand et al.

According to the Abstract, Nordstrand et al. ("Nordstrand") is purportedly directed to a subscription-based mobile station in which subscription-based information in a mobile telecommunications system is utilized to control idle mode operations of a mobile station. In one aspect, cell-related information is broadcast from cells. A mobile station then uses the received cell-related information to determine whether any given cell is part of a predefined service area that is reserved for use by only certain subscribers to the exclusion of other subscribers. The cell-related information may be a cell identifier that uniquely identifies a corresponding cell, or it may alternatively be a service area identifier that uniquely identifies a service area that comprises one or more cells. In either case, the mobile terminal makes its determination by accessing a memory such as a Subscriber Information Module (SIM), and retrieving therefrom stored information that defines the predefined service areas. In another aspect, the SIM may store information identifying preferred cells for the mobile station to camp on during idle mode.

Nordstrand teaches subscriber-specifically defined service areas (corresponding to local service areas of Salmela), but is totally silent on location updating and location areas. Accordingly, Nordstrand fails to teach or suggest "determining, in the mobile station, whether the mobile station is allowed to camp in the cell, in response to receiving a new location area identity LAC and the indication EA", as variously claimed in independent claims 10 and 19.

Further, Nordstrand fails to teach or suggest the concept of exclusive location areas, as well as to teaching or suggesting sending a location update request if camping is allowed, after the mobile station has determined whether camping is allowed. In Nordstrand, the cell broadcasts an "exclusive access" indicator. By using their specific subscriber-based information, some mobile stations may then ignore a "cell barred" indicator, and proceed with the cell re-selection procedure.

Since, according to conventional techniques, a mobile station may move within a location area from one cell to another cell of the location area ***without location update, finding a suitable cell in Nordstrand does not trigger sending a location update request.*** In Nordstrand, the location update request is triggered according to conventional techniques, *i.e.*, when a new location area code/identifier is received. Thus, Nordstrand fails to teach or suggest "if camping is allowed, sending a location update request", as variously claimed in independent claims 10 and 19.

However, as would be known to a person having skill in the art, cell re-selection relates to ***movement*** of a mobile station from one cell area to another, and it may lead to changeover, handover, or location updating. Nevertheless, ***the decision to continue cell re-selection procedure clearly does not correspond with sending a location update procedure.***

Thus, in Nordstrand, a location update may or may not take place after a detected "cell barred" indicator, disregarding the check whether the camping to the particular cell is allowed or not.

Discussion of Seppanen et al.

According to the Abstract, Seppanen et al. ("Seppanen") is purportedly directed to a mobile terminal having enhanced system selection capability in which a single, prioritized list of all available networks (*i.e.*, all public, residential, and private networks). Access to the various networks is then based on the user's needs. A first type of access is an automatic access, that requires little or no user involvement. A second type of access is to a user-specified network. A third type of access is to a user-specified service (*e.g.*, data, fax, e-mail, etc.) that is supported by at least one of the networks. The mobile station can search for additional networks, and can also search for additional networks that support only a specified type of service, or for a network that supports a service not supported by networks that are already in the list. All of the networks can be searched at once so that the user can readily make a selection from the single, prioritized network list. The network priorities are user programmable by moving network names up and down in the list using a mobile station user interface, such as the mobile station's keypad. The higher the network name is placed in the list, the higher is the priority of the network.

Seppanen merely discloses that a mobile terminal searches for a suitable network and if a suitable network is not found, enters the limited service state. However, ***a suitable network is not the same as a suitable cell***. Thus, Seppanen fails to disclose that if a suitable cell is not found, the mobile terminal enters the limited service state.

Moreover, because Nordstrand teaches continuing the cell selection/re-selection process during the location update (see, Nordstrand, Figures 4 and 5) if a suitable cell is not found, a system resulting from the combined teachings of Nordstrand and Seppanen would merely provide a solution in which, if a suitable network is not found, the mobile station enters the limited service state but if a suitable network is found, the mobile terminal tries to find a suitable cell, and if a suitable cell is not found, the mobile terminal continues the cell selection/reselection process. That operation is contrary to Applicants' invention as variously recited in claims 10 and 19.

Further, since neither Nordstrand and Seppanen do not teach or suggest location areas or any related feature, they necessarily fail to teach or suggest any feature of claim 19, *e.g.*, "the mobile station being arranged to receive broadcast information about a location of the cell, the information including the LAC of the cell." In the Office Action, the Examiner states that a cell identifier corresponds to location area code/identifier. However, they are separate identifiers that identify different things.

Finally, Salmela teaches either to select one of the permitted cells or to connect to one of the forbidden cells, if it cannot otherwise receive network services (Salmela, page 14, lines 15-20). Therefore, by combining Seppanen with Salmela, one skilled in the art would merely provide a solution in which, if a suitable network is not initially found, the mobile station enters the limited service state, but if a suitable network has been found, the mobile terminal tries to find a suitable cell, and ***if a suitable cell is not found, instead of entering a limited service state, the mobile station would camp to an exclusive cell***. Another possible solution based on the combined teachings would have been that, if a suitable network is not found, then the mobile station camps in a non-suitable network. However, that too is contrary to what is claimed in claims 10 and 19. Therefore, claims 10 and 19 and their respective dependent claims are patentable over Salmela in view of Nordstrand and Seppanen.

Specific Deficiencies of the Applied Art

The applied art, either alone or in combination, does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for deciding whether to trigger a location update by a mobile station used by a subscriber, wherein the method includes, *inter alia*, "***defining location areas each associated with a respective location area identity, Location Area Code (LAC), so that all exclusive cells are in exclusive location areas comprising exclusive cells for which an exclusive service condition is defined...determining, in the mobile station, whether the mobile station is allowed to camp in the cell in response to receiving a new location area identity LAC and the indication EA indicating an exclusive cell in the broadcast; and...if camping is not allowed, trying to find a suitable cell in which to camp and if a suitable cell is not found, entering a limited service state in the mobile station***", as recited in independent claim 10, as amended (*emphasis added*).

Further, the applied art, either alone or in combination, does not disclose, teach or suggest a mobile station which supports cell service definitions in a mobile communications system comprising location areas each associated with a respective Location Area Code (LAC), wherein, *inter alia*, the mobile station is arranged "***...in response to receiving in the broadcast a new location area LAC and an indication indicating that the cell belongs to a location area defined to be an exclusive location area comprising exclusive cells for which an exclusive service condition is defined***, to use this exclusive service condition to determine whether or not the subscriber is allowed to camp in the cell, and if the mobile station is allowed to camp in the cell, to send a location update request to the system, or ***if the mobile station is not allowed to camp in the cell, to try to find a suitable cell in which to camp and if a suitable cell is not found, to enter a limited service state***", as recited in previously presented independent claim 19 (*emphasis added*).

Accordingly, since the applied art does not teach or suggest all the claimed limitations, reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 10 and 19 are respectfully requested. In addition, dependent claims 11 and 20 depend from these allowable independent claims, respectively, and are submitted as being allowable at least on that basis, without further recourse to the patentable features recited therein.

Unpatentability Rejection over Salmela et al. in View of Alleged "Well-Known" Art

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salmela et al. (WO 98/30056) in view of well-known art is requested. The examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. The legal requirements for unpatentability have been provided above. *Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's reliance upon allegedly "well-known art"* in teaching the recited "rejecting the location update with the cause 'roaming not allowed in this location area'" in dependent claim 9.

Improper Reliance Upon Allegedly "Well-Known Art"

As required by MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. As further stated in MPEP 2144.03, it is only appropriate in limited circumstances for an Examiner to rely on "common knowledge" or assertions of "well-known" art in making a rejection.

The MPEP goes on to in that section to require that any rejection based on assertions that a fact is well-known or is common knowledge in the art without documentary evidence to support the Examiner's conclusion should be judiciously applied. Furthermore, any facts so noticed should be of notorious character and serve only to "fill in the gaps" in an insubstantial manner which might exist in the evidentiary showing made by the Examiner to support a particular ground for rejection. It is never appropriate to rely solely on common knowledge in the art without evidentiary support in the record as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based.¹¹

Appellant submits that the Examiner's reliance on asserted "well known" features to provide a teaching of the recited "rejecting the location update with the cause 'roaming not allowed in this location area'" is not, in any sense, "gap filling".

If such features are, indeed, "well-known" in the art, then it should present no burden to the Examiner to present a properly combinable reference which provides a teaching or suggestion of the claimed limitation in a new, non-final office action.

Even if the Examiner is able to provide such a reference, it must still make up for the previously identified deficiencies of Salmela with respect to the anticipation rejection of independent claim 1, from which claim 9 depends.

¹¹ See *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 59 USPQ2d 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 165 USPQ 418 (CCPA 1970).

Specific Deficiencies of the Applied Art

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the feature indicated by the Examiner is, indeed "well-known", which Applicants specifically do not admit, the applied art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest a method for deciding whether a mobile station used by a subscriber is allowed to camp in a cell of a mobile communications system comprising location areas each associated with a respective Location Area Code (LAC), wherein the method includes, *inter alia*, ***"defining some of the location areas to be exclusive location areas each associated with a respective LAC, an exclusive location area comprising exclusive cells for which an exclusive service condition is defined..."***[and] if the new location area is an exclusive location area...allowing the mobile station to camp in the cell by accepting the location update if the subscriber is allowed to camp in the cell, and...preventing the mobile station from camping in the cell by rejecting the location update if the subscriber is not allowed to camp in the cell", as recited in previously presented independent claim 1, from which claim 9 depends (***emphasis*** added). Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claim 9 are requested.

Unpatentability Rejection over Nordstrand in View of Seppanen et al.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nordstrand (US 6,334,052 B1) in view of Seppanen et al. (US 5,903,832) is requested. The examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.

The legal requirements for unpatentability have been provided above, and both Nordstrand and Seppanen have been discussed above.

Specific Deficiencies of the Applied Art

The applied art, taken alone or in combination, does not disclose, teach or suggest a mobile station which supports cell service definitions in a mobile communications system comprising location areas each associated with a respective Location Area Code (LAC), wherein, *inter alia*, the mobile station is arranged "***...in response to receiving in the broadcast a new location area LAC and an indication indicating that the cell belongs to a location area defined to be an exclusive location area comprising exclusive cells for which an exclusive service condition is defined***, to use this exclusive service condition to determine whether or not the subscriber is

allowed to camp in the cell, and if the mobile station is allowed to camp in the cell, to send a location update request to the system, or ***if the mobile station is not allowed to camp in the cell, to try to find a suitable cell in which to camp and if a suitable cell is not found, to enter a limited service state***", as recited in previously presented independent claim 19 (*emphasis added*).

Accordingly, since the applied art does not teach or suggest all the claimed limitations, reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 19 are respectfully requested. In addition, dependent claim 20 depends from allowable independent claim 19, and is submitted as being allowable at least on that basis, without further recourse to the patentable features recited therein.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant submits that each of pending claims 1-20 in the present application is in immediate condition for allowance. An early indication of the same would be appreciated.

In the event the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues in this case, the Undersigned Attorney is available at the telephone number indicated below.

For any fees that are due, including fees for excess claims and/or extensions of time, please charge Deposit Account Number 03-3975 from which the Undersigned Attorney is authorized to draw. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Date: September 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature: /Larry J. Hume/
Larry J. Hume
Registration No.: 44,163
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900 (switchboard)
(703) 770-7981 (direct)
(703) 770-7901 (fax)
e-mail: Larry.Hume@pillsburylaw.com
Attorney for Applicant